Exhibit 24

Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence

Third Edition

Committee on the Development of the Third Edition of the
Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence

Committee on Science, Technology, and Law
Policy and Global Affairs

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS
Washington, D.C.
www.nap.edu

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS 500 Fifth Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20001

The Federal Judicial Center contributed to this publication in furtherance of the Center's statutory mission to develop and conduct educational programs for judicial branch employees. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Federal Judicial Center.

NOTICE: The project that is the subject of this report was approved by the Governing Board of the National Research Council, whose members are drawn from the councils of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine. The members of the committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competences and with regard for appropriate balance.

The development of the third edition of the *Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence* was supported by Contract No. B5727.R02 between the National Academy of Sciences and the Carnegie Corporation of New York and a grant from the Starr Foundation. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the National Academies or the organizations that provided support for the project.

International Standard Book Number-13: 978-0-309-21421-6
International Standard Book Number-10: 0-309-21421-1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Reference manual on scientific evidence. — 3rd ed.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-309-21421-6 (pbk.)
ISBN-10: 0-309-21421-1 (pbk.)
1. Evidence, Expert—United States. I. Federal Judicial Center.
KF8961.R44 2011
347.73′67—dc23

2011031458

Additional copies of this report are available from the National Academies Press, 500 Fifth Street, N.W., Lockbox 285, Washington, DC 20055; (800) 624-6242 or (202) 334-3313 (in the Washington metropolitan area); Internet, http://www.nap.edu.

Printed in the United States of America

THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

The Federal Judicial Center is the research and education agency of the federal judicial system. It was established by Congress in 1967 (28 U.S.C. §§ 620–629), on the recommendation of the Judicial Conference of the United States, with the mission to "further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts of the United States." By statute, the Chief Justice of the United States chairs the Federal Judicial Center's Board, which also includes the director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and seven judges elected by the Judicial Conference.

The Center undertakes empirical and exploratory research on federal judicial processes, court management, and sentencing and its consequences, often at the request of the Judicial Conference and its committees, the courts themselves, or other groups in the federal system. In addition to orientation and continuing education programs for judges and court staff on law and case management, the Center produces publications, videos, and online resources. The Center provides leadership and management education for judges and court employees, and other training as needed. Center research informs many of its educational efforts. The Center also produces resources and materials on the history of the federal courts, and it develops resources to assist in fostering effective judicial administration in other countries.

Since its founding, the Center has had nine directors. Judge Barbara J. Rothstein became director of the Federal Judicial Center in 2003

www.fjc.gov

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

The **National Academy of Sciences** is a private, nonprofit, self-perpetuating society of distinguished scholars engaged in scientific and engineering research, dedicated to the furtherance of science and technology and to their use for the general welfare. Upon the authority of the charter granted to it by the Congress in 1863, the Academy has a mandate that requires it to advise the federal government on scientific and technical matters. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone is president of the National Academy of Sciences.

The **National Academy of Engineering** was established in 1964, under the charter of the National Academy of Sciences, as a parallel organization of outstanding engineers. It is autonomous in its administration and in the selection of its members, sharing with the National Academy of Sciences the responsibility for advising the federal government. The National Academy of Engineering also sponsors engineering programs aimed at meeting national needs, encourages education and research, and recognizes the superior achievements of engineers. Dr. Charles M. Vest is president of the National Academy of Engineering.

The **Institute of Medicine** was established in 1970 by the National Academy of Sciences to secure the services of eminent members of appropriate professions in the examination of policy matters pertaining to the health of the public. The Institute acts under the responsibility given to the National Academy of Sciences by its congressional charter to be an adviser to the federal government and, upon its own initiative, to identify issues of medical care, research, and education. Dr. Harvey V. Fineberg is president of the Institute of Medicine.

The **National Research Council** was organized by the National Academy of Sciences in 1916 to associate the broad community of science and technology with the Academy's purposes of furthering knowledge and advising the federal government. Functioning in accordance with general policies determined by the Academy, the Council has become the principal operating agency of both the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering in providing services to the government, the public, and the scientific and engineering communities. The Council is administered jointly by both Academies and the Institute of Medicine. Dr. Ralph J. Cicerone and Dr. Charles M. Vest are chair and vice chair, respectively, of the National Research Council.

www.national-academies.org

Committee on the Development of the Third Edition of the Reference Manual on Scientific Evidence

Co-Chairs:

JEROME P. KASSIRER (IOM), Distinguished Professor, Tufts University School of Medicine
GLADYS KESSLER, Judge, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia

Members:

MING W. CHIN, Associate Justice, The Supreme Court of California
PAULINE NEWMAN, Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
KATHLEEN MCDONALD O'MALLEY, Judge, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
JED S. RAKOFF, Judge, U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York
CHANNING R. ROBERTSON, Ruth G. and William K. Bowes Professor, School of Engineering, and Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, Stanford University
JOSEPH V. RODRICKS, Principal, Environ
ALLEN WILCOX, Senior Investigator, Institute of Environmental Health Sciences
SANDY L. ZABELL, Professor of Statistics and Mathematics, Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences, Northwestern University

Consultant to the Committee:

JOE S. CECIL, Project Director, Program on Scientific and Technical Evidence, Division of Research, Federal Judicial Center

Staff:

ANNE-MARIE MAZZA, Director
STEVEN KENDALL, Associate Program Officer
GURUPRASAD MADHAVAN, Program Officer (until November 2010)

Reference Guide on Epidemiology

MICHAEL D. GREEN, D. MICHAL FREEDMAN, AND LEON GORDIS

Michael D. Green, J.D., is Bess & Walter Williams Chair in Law, Wake Forest University School of Law, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

D. Michal Freedman, J.D., Ph.D., M.P.H., is Epidemiologist, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland.

Leon Gordis, M.D., M.P.H., Dr.P.H., is Professor Emeritus of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, and Professor Emeritus of Pediatrics, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland.

CONTENTS

D. Have the Results Been Replicated?

Rarely, if ever, does a single study persuasively demonstrate a cause–effect relationship.[162] It is important that a study be replicated in different populations and by different investigators before a causal relationship is accepted by epidemiologists and other scientists.[163]

The need to replicate research findings permeates most fields of science. In epidemiology, research findings often are replicated in different populations.[164] Consistency in these findings is an important factor in making a judgment about causation. Different studies that examine the same exposure–disease relationship generally should yield similar results. Although inconsistent results do not necessarily rule out a causal nexus, any inconsistencies signal a need to explore whether different results can be reconciled with causality.

E. Is the Association Biologically Plausible (Consistent with Existing Knowledge)?[165]

Biological plausibility is not an easy criterion to use and depends upon existing knowledge about the mechanisms by which the disease develops. When biological plausibility exists, it lends credence to an inference of causality. For example, the conclusion that high cholesterol is a cause of coronary heart disease is plausible because cholesterol is found in atherosclerotic plaques. However, observations have been made in epidemiologic studies that were not biologically plausible at the time but subsequently were shown to be correct.[166] When an observation is inconsistent with current biological knowledge, it should not be discarded, but

162. In *Kehm v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 580 F. Supp. 890, 901 (N.D. Iowa 1982), *aff'd*, 724 F.2d 613 (8th Cir. 1983), the court remarked on the persuasive power of multiple independent studies, each of which reached the same finding of an association between toxic shock syndrome and tampon use.

163. This may not be the legal standard, however. *Cf.* Smith v. Wyeth-Ayerst Labs. Co., 278 F. Supp. 2d 684, 710 n.55 (W.D.N.C. 2003) (observing that replication is difficult to establish when there is only one study that has been performed at the time of trial).

164. *See* Cadarian v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc., 745 F. Supp. 409, 412 (E.D. Mich. 1989) (holding a study on Bendectin insufficient to support an expert's opinion, because "the study's authors themselves concluded that the results could not be interpreted without independent confirmatory evidence").

165. A number of courts have adverted to this criterion in the course of their discussions of causation in toxic substances cases. *E.g., In re* Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig., 289 F. Supp. 2d 1230, 1247–48 (W.D. Wash. 2003); Cook v. United States, 545 F. Supp. 306, 314–15 (N.D. Cal. 1982) (discussing biological implausibility of a two-peak increase of disease when plotted against time); Landrigan v. Celotex Corp., 605 A.2d 1079, 1085–86 (N.J. 1992) (discussing the existence vel non of biological plausibility); *see also* Bernard D. Goldstein & Mary Sue Henifin, Reference Guide on Toxicology, Section III.E, in this manual.

166. *See In re* Rezulin Prods. Liab. Litig., 369 F. Supp. 2d 398, 405 (S.D.N.Y. 2005); *In re* Phenylpropanolamine (PPA) Prods. Liab. Litig., 289 F. Supp. 2d 1230, 1247 (W.D. Wash. 2003).

the observation should be confirmed before significance is attached to it. The saliency of this factor varies depending on the extent of scientific knowledge about the cellular and subcellular mechanisms through which the disease process works. The mechanisms of some diseases are understood quite well based on the available evidence, including from toxicologic research, whereas other mechanism explanations are merely hypothesized—although hypotheses are sometimes accepted under this factor.[167]

F. Have Alternative Explanations Been Considered?

The importance of considering the possibility of bias and confounding and ruling out the possibilities is discussed above.[168]

G. What Is the Effect of Ceasing Exposure?

If an agent is a cause of a disease, then one would expect that cessation of exposure to that agent ordinarily would reduce the risk of the disease. This has been the case, for example, with cigarette smoking and lung cancer. In many situations, however, relevant data are simply not available regarding the possible effects of ending the exposure. But when such data are available and eliminating exposure reduces the incidence of disease, this factor strongly supports a causal relationship.

H. Does the Association Exhibit Specificity?

An association exhibits specificity if the exposure is associated only with a single disease or type of disease.[169] The vast majority of agents do not cause a wide vari-

167. *See* Douglas L. Weed & Stephen D. Hursting, *Biologic Plausibility in Causal Inference: Current Methods and Practice,* 147 Am. J. Epidemiology 415 (1998) (examining use of this criterion in contemporary epidemiologic research and distinguishing between alternative explanations of what constitutes biological plausibility, ranging from mere hypotheses to "sufficient evidence to show how the factor influences a known disease mechanism").

168. *See supra* Sections IV.B–C.

169. This criterion reflects the fact that although an agent causes one disease, it does not necessarily cause other diseases. *See, e.g.,* Nelson v. Am. Sterilizer Co., 566 N.W.2d 671, 676–77 (Mich. Ct. App. 1997) (affirming dismissal of plaintiff's claims that chemical exposure caused her liver disorder, but recognizing that evidence supported claims for neuropathy and other illnesses); Sanderson v. Int'l Flavors & Fragrances, Inc., 950 F. Supp. 981, 996–98 (C.D. Cal. 1996); *see also* Taylor v. Airco, Inc., 494 F. Supp. 2d 21, 27 (D. Mass. 2007) (holding that plaintiff's expert could testify to causal relationship between vinyl chloride and one type of liver cancer for which there was only modest support given strong causal evidence for vinyl chloride and another type of liver cancer).

When a party claims that evidence of a causal relationship between an agent and one disease is relevant to whether the agent caused another disease, courts have required the party to show that